



General Government Division

B-279780

September 21, 1998

The Honorable Danny K. Davis
House of Representatives

Subject: U.S. Postal Service: Information About Selected Promotions of Women and Minorities to EAS Management-Level Positions

Dear Mr. Davis:

This letter responds to your January 23, 1998, request for information on promotions of women and minorities to management-level jobs under the Postal Service's Executive and Administrative Schedule (EAS). You were concerned that women and minorities may be experiencing problems being promoted to high-level EAS management jobs.

As agreed with your office, our objectives for this letter were to determine (1) whether the Postal Service's required promotion procedures were followed at selected locations for promotions to EAS levels 16 and above during fiscal year 1997 and (2) for these promotions, the percentages of women and minorities who submitted applications, were considered best qualified, and were promoted; also, how these percentages compared to women's and minorities' EAS levels 16 and above workforce representation at each respective location, before the promotions. In addition, we identified the equal employment opportunity (EEO) groups, specifically the gender and race/national origin, of those who applied for these promotions, those who were considered best qualified for the promotions, and those who were promoted.¹

¹The term "best qualified" as used in this letter refers to applicants recommended by a promotion review committee to the selecting official or, when a review committee was not used, refers to applicants that the selecting official interviewed before selecting the applicant to be promoted. If a review committee was not used and if the selecting official did not interview applicants, we did not include any applicants in the best-qualified category for any of our analyses.

You also asked that we conduct additional, more extensive work to (1) determine the overall extent to which women and minorities have been promoted to high-level EAS management jobs in the Postal Service; (2) provide suggestions we might have about how the Service can better capture and use data to achieve its diversity plans and goals; and (3) provide observations we might have on the methodology used by a private contractor, Aguirre International, to study workforce diversity at the Postal Service.² As agreed with your office, we will report on the results of this additional work at a later date.

To obtain the information needed for our first objective, we reviewed promotions to 127 EAS management-level positions (EAS levels 16 and above) during fiscal year 1997 at 4 Postal Service performance clusters—Atlanta, GA; Dallas and Fort Worth, TX; and Van Nuys, CA.³ We determined compliance with the Service's required promotion procedures by reviewing evidence of compliance through documentation in the promotion vacancy files as well as by discussing the documentation requirements with Service officials at the four clusters. Our initial work was done at the Service's Fort Worth performance cluster because its proximity to our available staff resources reduced the time and travel costs needed to do the work. At Fort Worth, we reviewed a judgmental sample of 10 of the 63 promotions to EAS levels 16 (entry level for EAS management positions) and above jobs made during fiscal year 1997 to determine the type of information available in promotion vacancy files and the time required to review the files and obtain the information needed to do our analyses. We selected the 10 promotions to provide a mix of promotions at the various EAS levels 16 and above.

Subsequently, we selected and reviewed all such promotions at the Dallas, Atlanta, and Van Nuys performance clusters. We selected these performance clusters because Service data showed disparities between the percentages of white men in high-level EAS management jobs compared to the percentages of white men in each performance cluster's workforce. Also, the Atlanta and Van Nuys performance clusters provided geographic dispersion for our work.

To obtain the information needed for our remaining objectives, we determined from Postal Service records the extent that women and minorities applied for, were considered best qualified, and were promoted for 117 of these 127 promotions. Also, using Postal Service data, we determined how these percentages compared to women's and minorities' EAS levels 16 and above workforce representation at each of

²It's Good Business—A Study of Diversity in the United States Postal Service, Aguirre International, Oct. 27, 1997.

³A performance cluster is 1 of the Postal Service's 85 geographic service areas and includes a customer service district, which is responsible for overseeing post offices, and 1 or more mail processing plants.

the three respective locations, before the promotions. Further, we analyzed the percentages at which women and minorities were represented in the Atlanta, Dallas, and Van Nuys performance cluster workforces at EAS levels 16, 17 and above, and 16 and above, as well as the EEO group data, for 117 of the 127 promotions. We excluded the promotions we reviewed at the Fort Worth performance cluster from these analyses because 10 promotions were too few for meaningful analyses of the EEO group data. We did not verify data we obtained from the Service concerning the applicant EEO group data for the promotions we reviewed or the Service career workforce EEO group data for the three performance clusters we analyzed. We also did not evaluate the adequacy of the Service's promotion procedures or determine whether those applicants promoted were the best choices. The results of our work cannot be generalized to other performance clusters or to the Postal Service overall.

Because your concern involved the extent to which women and minorities were being promoted to high-level EAS management positions, we compared the promotion percentages of women and minorities for the 117 promotions we reviewed to their percentages of representation in the workforce. The representation was the percentage of women and minorities already at the corresponding EAS level grouping in each performance cluster before the promotions. This comparison was intended to help provide some context for data analysis. However, we recognize that other comparisons could be made, such as comparisons to the general civilian labor force at each location or to the overall postal or EAS workforce in each cluster. Accordingly, we did not draw conclusions based on the comparisons we made.

We performed our work from January through August, 1998, in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. We requested comments on a draft of this letter from the Postmaster General. The Postal Service's oral comments are discussed near the end of this letter.

RESULTS IN BRIEF

Documentation in the promotion vacancy files and our discussions with Postal Service officials provided evidence indicating the Service's required promotion procedures we reviewed were followed for the 127 fiscal year 1997 promotions at the 4 performance clusters.

A total of 1,164 applications were received for the 117 promotions to EAS levels 16 and above that we reviewed at the Atlanta, Dallas, and Van Nuys performance clusters. Of these applications, 64 percent were submitted by women and minorities; 64 percent of the applicants considered best qualified were women and minorities; and 62 percent of those promoted were women and minorities. Variation in the percentages existed among the clusters, and in no case did women and minorities receive less than 50 percent of the promotions. In addition, 62 percent of those in the three clusters who were promoted to EAS levels 16 and above were women and

minorities compared to their representation rate of 59 percent at the same grade levels in all three clusters combined, before the promotions.

Finally, when looking at the distribution of specific EEO groups (e.g., black men, Hispanic women, and white men) throughout the three promotion process stages—application, considered best qualified, and promoted—for the promotions reviewed to EAS levels 16 and above, white men accounted for the largest percentage of applications submitted, considered best qualified, and promoted throughout all three clusters. When considering the distribution of the remaining EEO groups at all of the three promotion process stages, the specific EEO group accounting for the highest percentages varied among the clusters.

BACKGROUND

In November 1996, the Postal Service Board of Governors contracted with Aguirre International to study workforce diversity at the Service. After completing its work, Aguirre issued its report and briefed the Board of Governors in January 1998 on its study results. Although Aguirre concluded that the Service was a leader in meeting affirmative action goals and in striving for EEO parity between the civilian labor force and its own workforce, Aguirre identified opportunities for the Service to strengthen its diversity efforts.⁴ Also, Aguirre reported that women and minorities may be experiencing problems advancing to management jobs at EAS levels 17 and above and that promotions to these jobs might be based more upon favoritism than adherence to formal promotion procedures.

The Board of Governors directed the Service to develop an action plan for dealing with the diversity issues raised by Aguirre. In April 1998, Service officials briefed the Board of Governors on their action plan. Under the plan, the Service intends to (1) establish an Associate Manager Program by the end of calendar year 1998 to play a proactive role in identifying entry-level EAS managers (EAS 16) who can be promoted to mid-level managerial jobs above the EAS 16 level; (2) increase the focus on diversity in the promotion selection process by requiring diversity training as a prerequisite to serving on promotion review committees; and (3) ensure that Service managers understand the importance the Service places on diversity by providing that, no later than fiscal year 2000, diversity goals will be a performance indicator used in determining the total compensation of managers. Further, Service officials said that the action plan will emphasize diversity and parity with the civilian labor force and thus achieve a more diversified workforce at EAS management levels. In August 1998, Service officials told us that elements of the plan were progressing on schedule.

Postal Service Positions

⁴The civilian labor force represents persons aged 16 years or more, excluding those in the armed forces, who are employed or seeking employment.

At the end of fiscal year 1997 the Service had 765,174 career employees. EAS management-level supervisors and managers totaled 61,964, or about 8 percent of the total career employees. The EAS begins at level 1, and employees may progress through promotion up to EAS level 30. The EAS management level begins at level 16. As of September 1997, about 52 percent of the Service's employees in EAS management-level positions were in the EAS 16 level, with the remaining 48 percent in EAS levels 17 and above. EAS positions include jobs such as Postmaster, Manager of Customer Services, Supervisor of Maintenance Operations, Manager of Human Resources, Manager of Postal Office Operations, and various other administrative and/or clerical jobs.

The Postal Career Executive Service (PCES), which was established in 1979, comprises Service senior-level officers and executives and includes positions such as Area Vice Presidents and Bulk Mail Center managers.⁵ At the end of fiscal year 1997, the Service had 929 PCES employees, of which 183 were in EAS positions. None of the promotions that we reviewed involved PCES positions.

PROMOTION PROCEDURES DOCUMENTED
AS REQUIRED FOR CASES REVIEWED

Postal Service EAS selection policies require that promotion vacancy files document compliance with eight promotion procedures, when applicable. Our review of the documentation available and discussions with Service officials at the 4 locations we visited indicated that the Service's required promotion procedures were followed for the 127 promotions we reviewed.

Under Postal Service EAS Selection Policies issued in 1993 and updated in January 1995, copies of promotion vacancy announcements are to be provided to all postal installations in the areas of consideration for posting on employee bulletin boards. Postal employees in the areas of consideration may apply for any EAS job for which they believe they qualify. Vacancy announcements are to be posted for at least 15 calendar days.

The selecting official is the manager of the unit with the job vacancy and is expected to select for promotion the applicant who has the knowledge, skills, and abilities that "best meet" the requirements of the position and who has a high probability of successful performance in the job. The selecting official is to review all applications and interview as many applicants as he or she believes is necessary to decide the best candidate for promotion. However, the selecting official has the option of using a review committee for reducing the number of applicants to only those "highly recommended," or "best qualified," for the job.

⁵PCES positions are filled through a different process than the one that is used to fill EAS positions.

If a review committee is used, the committee is to contain at least three managers who have knowledge of the job requirements, affirmative action, and EAS selection methods. Diversity among review committee members is also to be considered. If used, review committees are to (1) review applications, (2) interview as many applicants as the committee believes necessary, and (3) develop a recommended list of candidates who best meet the job requirements.

According to the Service, its EAS selection policies were designed to provide selecting officials with the maximum flexibility needed to select individuals who are most likely to succeed. Further, the Service's Headquarters' Human Resources Manager of Selection, Evaluation, and Recognition stated that the policies were intended to provide managers with the flexibility they need to choose the person that they believe best meets the qualifications established for the job. He also stated that an applicant's gender or EEO group attributes were not to be considered by selecting officials in deciding who should be promoted.

The Service's selection policies required that promotion vacancy files contain the following documentation of promotion procedures:

- the vacancy announcement specifying that announcements were to be open for at least 15 days;
- the job description, and the knowledge, skills, and abilities requirements for the vacancy;
- an assessment of special problems, such as labor-management problems, or community-based problems that an applicant, if selected, may encounter (when applicable);
- all applications for the vacancy;
- the review committee's recommendation memorandum signed by all committee members (when applicable);
- letters to applicants who were not selected for promotion;
- the Promotion Report (PS Form 5938), showing who applied, who was interviewed, and who was promoted; and
- exception memorandums justifying any departures from policy (when applicable).

Required Promotion Procedures
Followed for Promotions Reviewed

Documentation in the promotion vacancy files and discussions with Postal Service officials provided evidence indicating that the Service's required promotion procedures we reviewed were followed for the 127 promotions. In each promotion vacancy file, we found documentation of a vacancy announcement specifying at least 15 days between the opening and closing dates; a job description specifying the knowledge, skills, and ability requirements of the position; copies of letters to applicants who were not selected for promotion; when applicable, a review committee recommendation memorandum signed by committee members; and copies of the Promotion Report identifying the applicants for promotion, the applicants interviewed, and the applicant selected for the promotion.

Our assessment of the Service's adherence to required promotion procedures was based on a review of those procedures required to be documented in the promotion vacancy files and on our discussions of the requirements with Service officials at each performance cluster. However, we could not conclusively determine whether a few of the required procedures were followed because documentation was only required when the procedure was applicable. For example, although there were no assessments of special needs or community issues or memorandums justifying exceptions from required procedures in any of the promotion vacancy files we reviewed, we found no indication from our review of the files or our discussions with Service officials that these procedures were applicable for the promotions we reviewed.

In addition, we determined that, when used, review committees consisted of at least three members, and the committees' recommendation memorandums were signed by all committee members. However, because there was no requirement that committee members' knowledge in the areas (i.e., job requirements, affirmative action, and EAS selection methods) required by Service policy be documented, we could not determine whether this procedure was followed. Further, we could not determine whether the vacancy announcements were posted in all required locations.

Required Procedures Supplemented
For Promotions Reviewed

In addition to following the promotion procedures in effect in fiscal year 1997, we found that the four performance clusters generally supplemented those procedures for the cases we reviewed with procedures that were no longer required by the Service. For example, we found that selecting officials' promotion decisions were reviewed and approved by higher level officials for 125 of the 127 promotions we reviewed. In addition, we found that review committees were generally used if there were more than five applicants for a promotion. Neither of these procedures had been required

since current Service promotion procedures were established in 1993 and updated in 1995.

The Service officials we contacted at the performance clusters about the use of promotion procedures that are no longer required told us that they continued to use these procedures because they were familiar with them and believed the procedures helped ensure that promotion decisions were fair. According to the Service's Headquarters' Human Resources Manager of Selection, Evaluation, and Recognition, the procedures adopted in 1993 and updated in 1995 provided managers with greater flexibility to choose the applicants they believed best met the qualifications established for the advertised position. He said that he was aware that some local offices have continued to use procedures no longer required and that he did not believe supplementing current procedures was a problem.

PERCENTAGES AT WHICH WOMEN AND MINORITIES PROGRESSED THROUGH THE PROMOTION PROCESS

Generally, for the promotions we reviewed, women and minorities progressed through the Service's promotion process stages for EAS levels 16 and above at varying percentages by performance cluster and EAS levels (16, 17 and above, and 16 and above). Also, the percentages at which individual EEO groups progressed through the three promotion process stages varied by EAS level at each performance cluster as well as among the three clusters combined.

When analyzing the percentages at which applicants are promoted, it is important to consider that an applicant must first apply for the promotion and then, when applicable, be considered best qualified for the promotion to have a chance of being selected for the promotion. Because concern has been expressed about the extent to which women and minorities have been promoted to higher level EAS management positions, it was also helpful to consider the extent to which women and minorities were already represented in the EAS levels 16 and above workforce. Thus, the information in the following sections shows how women and minorities progressed through the promotion process from being an applicant, to being considered best qualified, and then to being promoted for the 117 promotions to EAS levels 16 and above that we reviewed at the Atlanta, Dallas, and Van Nuys performance clusters. We also show the percentages of women and minorities who were in the Service's EAS levels 16 and above workforce as of September 1996 in the Atlanta, Dallas, and Van Nuys clusters. Because about one-half of the Service's workforce in EAS management-level positions were at EAS level 16, we have structured our analysis to separately show EAS level 16, levels 17 and above, and finally, levels 16 and above. We did not include EEO group data from the Fort Worth performance cluster in these analyses because we reviewed only 10 of the 63 promotions at Fort Worth.

Because these data are limited to what we found in only 3 performance clusters for the 117 promotions we reviewed, the results of our work cannot be generalized to other performance clusters or to the Postal Service overall.

Percentages of Women and Minorities Who Submitted Applications, Were Considered Best Qualified, and Were Promoted

A total of 1,164 applications were received for the 117 promotions we reviewed at the 3 performance clusters. Of these applications, 64 percent were submitted by women and minorities. The percentage of applications submitted by women and minorities was 57 percent in Dallas, 63 percent in Atlanta, and 72 percent in Van Nuys.

Overall, 475 applicants were considered best qualified, and 64 percent of those were women and minorities. The percentage of best-qualified applicants that were women and minorities was 55 percent in Dallas, 66 percent in Atlanta, and 71 percent in Van Nuys.

Of the 117 promotions, 62 percent went to women and minorities. The percentage of those promoted that were women and minorities was 53 percent in Dallas, 63 percent in Van Nuys, and 68 percent in Atlanta.

Analyses of EAS Levels 16 and Above Promotions by Cluster, Process Stage, and Performance Cluster Workforce

Overall, the percentage of women and minorities varied at each of the three performance clusters and by grade levels as women and minorities moved through the promotion process—application, considered best qualified, and promoted—to EAS level 16, levels 17 and above, and levels 16 and above. Variances also existed among the percentages of women and minorities at these three stages when compared to their percentages in each performance cluster's EAS levels 16 and above workforce before the promotions (see table 1).

Table 1: Women's and Minorities' Progress by Promotion Process Stage and EAS Level Compared to EAS Workforce Representation, by Cluster

EAS level/ Performance cluster	Percentage of women and minorities in workforce cluster by EAS level	Three promotion process stages		
		Percentage of total applications submitted by women and minorities	Percentage of best qualified women and minority applicants	Percentage of promotions to women and minority applicants
Level 16				
Atlanta	68%	68%	70%	74%
Dallas	61	64	60	50
Van Nuys	63	80	82	65
Average for 3 clusters	64%	71%	70%	63%
Level 17+				
Atlanta	53%	61%	63%	64%
Dallas	47	49	49	56
Van Nuys	52	57	59	60
Average for 3 clusters	50%	57%	58%	60%
Level 16+				
Atlanta	62%	63%	66%	68%
Dallas	56	57	55	53
Van Nuys	59	72	71	63
Average for 3 clusters	59%	64%	64%	62%

Source: GAO analysis of Postal Service Sept. 1996 workforce data and files in the Atlanta, Dallas, and Van Nuys clusters.

As shown in table 1, differences existed in the promotion percentages for women and minorities among the 3 performance clusters and in the percentages of women and minorities promoted when compared to the percentages of representation in each cluster's EAS levels 16 and above workforce before the promotions. For example, for the promotions we reviewed to EAS levels 16 and above, the percentage of women and minorities promoted was 68 percent in Atlanta, 53 percent in Dallas, and 63 percent in Van Nuys, compared to the cluster EAS levels 16 and above workforce percentages of 62 percent, 56 percent, and 59 percent, respectively. Further, for the promotions we reviewed at EAS level 16 for Atlanta and Van Nuys, the percentages of women and minorities promoted were higher than their workforce representation at EAS level 16, while for Dallas, the percentage of those promoted was lower than their EAS level 16 cluster workforce representation. For promotions to EAS levels 17 and above, the percentages of women and minorities promoted were higher than their workforce representation in EAS levels 17 and above in each of the 3 clusters.

Distribution of EEO Groupings Varied by Cluster
Across the Three Promotion Stages

Our analyses of the 117 promotions at the 3 performance clusters identified variances among the specific EEO groups throughout the performance clusters as well as by promotion process stage. For EAS levels 16 and above, white men constituted the largest percentage distribution for a specific EEO group for all three process stages across all clusters. For women and minority EEO groups, at the three stages, the specific group receiving the highest percentage distribution varied among the clusters; American Indian/Alaskan Native women did not apply for promotion to EAS levels 16 and above at any of the 3 clusters.

Enclosure I presents for each performance cluster the percentage distribution by EEO group at the three promotion process stages by EAS level. As shown in the enclosure, we found that at each cluster, a greater percentage of applications for promotion were submitted by white men than by any other individual EEO group. Also, at EAS levels 16 and above combined, white men received the highest percentage of promotions in each cluster. However, when looking at EAS level 16 only, black women received the highest percentage of promotions in the Atlanta cluster; at EAS levels 17 and above in Atlanta, both white men and black men received the highest percentages of promotions.

When looking only at women and minorities throughout the three stages of the promotion process, the percentages of applications, applicants considered best qualified, and those promoted varied among the three performance clusters. For example, in Atlanta at EAS levels 16 and above, the largest percentage of applications came from black women; this same pattern was also generally found at the best qualified and promotion stages. In Dallas, black men constituted the largest percentage of applications; black women were the largest percentage of best qualified, and white women received the largest percentage of promotions. In Van Nuys, Hispanic men constituted the largest percentage of applications; Hispanic men were the largest percentage of those considered best qualified; and Hispanic men and white women received the largest percentage of promotions. In Atlanta, no applications for promotion were submitted by Hispanic women; across all three clusters, no applications were submitted by American Indian/Alaskan Native women.

These data are limited to what we found in only 3 performance clusters for the 117 promotions we reviewed. We plan to provide additional information related to the promotions of women and minorities for the entire Postal Service between postal fiscal years 1993 and 1997 in a subsequent report.

AGENCY COMMENTS AND OUR EVALUATION

On September 3, 1998, we requested comments on a draft of this letter from the Postmaster General. On September 10, 1998, the Postal Service's Vice-President of Human Resources and the Vice-President of Diversity Development informed us orally that they concurred with the information provided in the letter.

- - - - -

We are sending copies of this letter to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee on the Postal Service, House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee on International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services, Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs; and the Postmaster General. We will also make copies available to others upon request.

Major contributors to this letter were Sherrill H. Johnson, Assistant Director; Billy W. Scott, Evaluator-in-Charge; William R. Chatlos, Senior Social Science Analyst; and Hazel J. Bailey, Communications Analyst. If you have any questions about this letter, please call me on (202) 512-8387.

Sincerely yours,



Bernard L. Ungar
Director, Government Business
Operations Issues

Enclosure

DATA ON SELECTED PROMOTIONS AT THE INDIVIDUAL PERFORMANCE CLUSTERS

The following tables present information on the EEO groups for the 117 promotions we reviewed. The 3 promotion process stages, by EAS level, include the (1) applications submitted, (2) applicants considered best qualified, and (3) applicants promoted to the 117 promotions to EAS level 16 and above that we reviewed at the Atlanta, Dallas, and Van Nuys performance clusters. Also, because the EEO attributes of applicants at individual performance clusters may differ from those of the aggregate, we have presented this information separately for the three performance clusters.

Table I.1: Atlanta Performance Cluster

EAS level	Process stage	Total			White				Black				Hispanic				American Asian/ Pacific Islander				American Indian/ Alaskan Native			
		Men	Women	All	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
					No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
16	A	114	97	211	68	32.2%	31	14.7%	41	19.4%	63	29.9%	2	0.9%	0	0.0%	2	0.9%	3	1.4%	1	0.5%	0	0.0%
	B	44	52	96	29	30.2	15	15.6	14	14.6	35	36.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.0	2	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
	C	8	11	19	5	26.3	3	15.8	2	10.5	7	36.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	1	5.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
17+	A	220	126	346	136	39.3%	59	17.1%	79	22.8%	67	19.4%	3	0.9%	0	0.0%	2	0.6%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	B	74	34	108	40	37.0	15	13.9	34	31.5	19	17.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	C	16	6	22	8	36.4	3	13.6	8	36.4	3	13.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total 16+	A	334	223	557	204	36.6%	90	16.1%	120	21.5%	130	23.3%	5	0.9%	0	0.0%	4	0.7%	3	0.5%	1	0.2%	0	0.0%
	B	118	86	204	69	33.8	30	14.7	48	23.5	54	26.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.5	2	1.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	C	24	17	41	13	31.7	6	14.6	10	24.4	10	24.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.4	1	2.4	0	0.0	0	0.0

Legend: A - Applications
 B - Considered best qualified
 C - Promoted

Source: GAO analysis of U.S. Postal Service files in the Atlanta Performance Cluster District Office.

Table I.2: Dallas Performance Cluster

EAS level	Process stage	Total			White				Black				Hispanic				American Asian/ Pacific Islander				American Indian/ Alaskan Native			
		Men	Women	All	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
					No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
16	A	102	66	168	60	35.7%	27	16.1%	31	18.5%	36	21.4%	7	4.2%	2	1.2%	3	1.8%	1	0.6%	1	0.6%	0	0.0%
	B	45	32	77	31	40.3	10	13.0	11	14.3	22	28.6	2	2.6	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	C	16	6	22	11	50.0	2	9.1	3	13.6	4	18.2	2	9.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
17+	A	98	36	134	69	51.5%	20	14.9%	20	14.9%	9	6.7%	6	4.5%	7	5.2%	3	2.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
	B	48	17	65	33	50.8	10	15.4	8	12.3	4	6.2	5	7.7	3	4.6	2	3.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	C	12	4	16	7	43.8	4	25.0	1	6.3	0	0.0	3	18.8	0	0.0	1	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total 16+	A	200	102	302	129	42.7%	47	15.6%	51	16.9%	45	14.9%	13	4.3%	9	3.0%	6	2.0%	1	0.3%	1	0.3%	0	0.0%
	B	93	49	142	64	45.0	20	14.1	19	13.4	26	18.3	7	4.9	3	2.1	3	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	C	28	10	38	18	47.4	6	15.8	4	10.5	4	10.5	5	13.2	0	0.0	1	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Legend: A - Applications
 B - Considered best qualified
 C - Promoted

Source: GAO analysis of U.S. Postal Service files in the Dallas Performance Cluster District Office.

Table I.3: Van Nuys Performance Cluster

EAS level	Process stage	Totals			White				Black				Hispanic				American Asian/ Pacific Islander				American Indian/ Alaskan Native			
		Men	Women	All	Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women		Men		Women	
					No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
16	A	128	70	198	40	20.2%	25	12.6%	22	11.1%	17	8.6%	28	14.1%	12	6.1%	29	14.6%	16	8.1%	9	4.5%	0	0.0%
	B	45	26	71	13	18.3	9	12.7	6	8.5	6	8.5	12	16.9	5	7.0	9	12.7	6	8.5	5	7.0	0	0.0
	C	16	7	23	8	34.8	3	13.0	0	0.0	1	4.3	3	13.0	2	8.7	4	17.4	1	4.3	1	4.3	0	0.0
17+	A	82	25	107	46	43.0%	9	8.4%	11	10.3%	4	3.7%	15	14.0%	8	7.5%	7	6.5%	4	3.7%	3	2.8%	0	0.0%
	B	46	12	58	24	41.4	6	10.3	5	8.6	1	1.7	12	20.7	4	6.9	4	6.9	1	1.7	1	1.7	0	0.0
	C	11	4	15	6	40.0	3	20.0	2	13.3	0	0.0	3	20.0	1	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total 16+	A	210	95	305	86	28.2%	34	11.1%	33	10.8%	21	6.9%	43	14.1%	20	6.6%	36	11.8%	20	6.6%	12	3.9%	0	0%
	B	89	38	127	36	28.1	15	11.7	10	7.8	7	5.5	24	18.8	9	7.0	13	10.2	7	5.5	6	4.7	0	0
	C	27	11	38	14	36.8	6	15.8	2	5.3	1	2.6	6	15.8	3	7.9	4	10.5	1	2.6	1	0	0	0

Legend: A - Applications
 B - Considered best qualified
 C - Promoted

Source: GAO analysis of U.S. Postal Service files in the Van Nuys Performance Cluster District Office.

(240288)

Ordering Information

The first copy of each GAO report and testimony is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. Orders should be sent to the following address, accompanied by a check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents, when necessary. VISA and MasterCard credit cards are accepted, also. Orders for 100 or more copies to be mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent.

Orders by mail:

**U.S. General Accounting Office
P.O. Box 37050
Washington, DC 20013**

or visit:

**Room 1100
700 4th St. NW (corner of 4th and G Sts. NW)
U.S. General Accounting Office
Washington, DC**

Orders may also be placed by calling (202) 512-6000 or by using fax number (202) 512-6061, or TDD (202) 512-2537.

Each day, GAO issues a list of newly available reports and testimony. To receive facsimile copies of the daily list or any list from the past 30 days, please call (202) 512-6000 using a touchtone phone. A recorded menu will provide information on how to obtain these lists.

For information on how to access GAO reports on the INTERNET, send an e-mail message with "info" in the body to:

info@www.gao.gov

or visit GAO's World Wide Web Home Page at:

http://www.gao.gov

**United States
General Accounting Office
Washington, D.C. 20548-0001**

**Bulk Mail
Postage & Fees Paid
GAO
Permit No. G100**

**Official Business
Penalty for Private Use \$300**

Address Correction Requested
